arXiv:math/0106060v1 [math.AG] 8 Jun 2001

PATTERNS OF DEPENDENCE AMONG POWERS OF POLYNOMIALS

Bruce Reznick

June 3, 2001

Abstract. Let $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ be a family of polynomials and let the ticket of F, $T(F)$, denote the set of integers m so that $\{f_j^m\}$ is linearly dependent. We show that $|T(F)| \le \binom{r-1}{2}$ and present many concrete examples.

1. Introduction and definitions

The motivation for this paper is a remarkable example due to A. H. Desboves in 1880 (see [3, p.684]) and, independently, N. Elkies [2, p.542] in 1995.

Example 1.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x,y) &= x^2 + \sqrt{2}xy - y^2, \quad & f_2(x,y) &= ix^2 - \sqrt{2}xy + iy^2, \\ f_3(x,y) &= -x^2 + \sqrt{2}xy + y^2, \quad & f_4(x,y) &= -ix^2 - \sqrt{2}xy - iy^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Then $\sum_j f_j^5 = 0$. It is not hard to show that $\sum_j f_j = \sum_j f_j^2 = 0$ as well, but it can be shown that $\{f_j^m\}$ is linearly independent for other integers m. This is surprising, and not only because of the gap in the exponents. Let $M_m(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = \sum_j t_j^m$. Then (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4) parameterizes the intersection $\{M_1 = 0\} \cap \{M_2 = 0\} \cap \{M_5 = 0\} \subset \mathbf{C}^4$. This is not what one would expect geometrically; however, Newton's Theorem for symmetric forms implies that $M_5 \in (M_1, M_2)$, so $\{M_5 = 0\} \subset \big(\{M_1 = 0\} \cap \{M_2 = 0\}\big)$. We shall return to (1.1) throughout this paper, and derive it in several different ways.

Let $F = \{f_j\}$ be a finite set of polynomials. The *ticket* of F, $T(F)$, is defined by

$$T(F) = \{m \in \mathbf{N} : \{f_j^m\} \text{ is linearly dependent}\}.$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11D41, 11E76, 14Q15, 32H25; Secondary 11P05, 15A99, 30D35.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

We let $\overline{m}(F)$ denote the maximum element of $T(F)$, with the understanding that $\overline{m}(F) = 0$ if $T(F) = \emptyset$. More specifically, for integers $r \ge 2$, $n \ge 2$, $d \ge 1$, let $\mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$ denote the set of families $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$, where each f_j is a homogeneous polynomial over $\mathbf{C}$ in n variables of degree d, and no two f_j's are proportional. Let

$$\mathcal{T}(r,n,d) = \{T(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)\}.$$

Let $\overline{m}_r$ denote the maximum of $\overline{m}(F)$, given $|F| = r$. It is known that $\overline{m}_r \le r^2 - 2r$. Finally, in view of the geometry of Example 1, we say that $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$ is a *dysfunctional* family if $|T(F)| > r - 2$, the term is used in the sense of excessive dependence.

Example 2.

Here are some families with tickets that are easy to verify by hand.

$$T(\{x,y,z\}) = \emptyset, \tag{1.2)(i}$$

$$T(\{x,y,x+y\}) = \{1\}, \tag{1.2)(ii}$$

$$T(\{x^2-y^2, 2xy, x^2+y^2\}) = \{2\}. \tag{1.2)(iii}$$

One of the principal goals of this research is to determine $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d)$. We are able to do so in the cases $r \le 3$, $(n,d) = (2,1)$, and $(r,n,d) = (4,2,2)$. Besides specifying (r,n,d), we can consider the sets which appear as the ticket of any family. Let

$$\mathcal{T} := \bigcup_{r,n,d} \mathcal{T}(r,n.d).$$

The following tends to strike listeners as either very plausible or ridiculous.

Conjecture 1. *$\mathcal{T}$ consists of all finite subsets of* $\mathbf{N}$.

There does not seem to be much in the literature on this subject, except for $\overline{m}_r$. If $r = 3$, then after scaling, $m \in T(F)$ implies that $f_1^m + f_2^m - f_3^m = 0$. In 1879, J. Liouville proved (see [13, p.263]) that Fermat's Last Theorem is true for non-constant polynomials, hence $\overline{m}_3 = 2$.

M. Green proved in 1975 [4, p.71] that if $\{\phi_j\}$, $1 \le j \le r$, are holomorphic functions in n complex variables, no two of which are proportional, and $\sum_{j=1}^{r} \phi_j^m = 0$, then $m \le (r-1)^2 - 1$. This implies that $\overline{m}_r \le r(r-2)$, and hence $|T(F)| \le r(r-2)$.

D. J. Newman and M. Slater proved in 1979 [10, p.481] that a non-zero sum of the m-th powers of r non-constant polynomials in a single complex variable has degree $\ge m - \binom{r}{2}$. (Their proof goes through for n variables as well.) By taking this sum to be 1 and homogenizing, it follows that if $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$ and one of the f_j's is a d-th power of a linear form, then $\overline{m}(F) \le \binom{r}{2} - 1$. They also show [10, p.486] that

$\overline{m}_r \le 8(r-1)^2 - 1$ for unrestricted F, but this is weaker than Green's bound. A 1972 example due to J. Molluzzo [9] shows that $\overline{m}_r \ge \lfloor \frac{(r-1)^2}{4} \rfloor$. Molluzzo's theorem is discussed in Example 12 below; the bound is improved here for $r \le 8$.

There is a connection to Nevanlinna theory. If $m \in T(F)$ for $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,2,d)$, then by dehomogenizing and transposing the linear relation among f_j^m, we obtain an equation $\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \phi_j^m(z) = 1$ in rational functions ϕ_j. A recent survey of this work has been made by W. Hayman [7]; see also [8]. G. Gundersen [5] has found meromorphic (not rational) functions g_j for which $g_1^6(z) + g_2^6(z) + g_3^6(z) = 1$.

We collect some trivial remarks, which will be used without citation throughout the rest of the paper.

If $f_j = \alpha f_i$, then f_i^m and f_j^m are dependent for every m, so $T(F) = \mathbf{N}$ is an uninteresting ticket. This explains the non-proportionality condition in the definition of $\mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$.

The dimension of the vector space of forms of degree D in n variables is $\binom{n+D-1}{n-1}$. Thus, if $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$ and if $r > \binom{n+md-1}{n-1}$, then $\{f_j^m\}$ must be dependent. In this case we say that m is *forced* to be in $T(F)$.

There is no *a priori* reason to assume that the polynomials in a given family F are all homogeneous and of the same degree. Suppose $F = \{f_j\}$, $1 \le j \le r$, where each f_j is a polynomial in n variables of degree $\le d$. Homogenize F by defining

$$f_j'(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) = x_{n+1}^d f_j\left(\frac{x_1}{x_{n+1}}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_{n+1}}\right), \qquad 1 \le j \le r,$$

and let $F' = \{f_j'\} \in \mathcal{F}(r, n+1, d)$. It is easy to see that $T(F) = T(F')$. Similarly, if we dehomogenize $G = \{g_j\} \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$, via

$$g_j'(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = g_j(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 1), \qquad 1 \le j \le r,$$

and let $G' = \{g_j'\}$, then $T(G) = T(G')$. Thus, there is no loss of generality in restricting ourselves to the various $\mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$'s.

If $F = \{f_j\}$ and

$$f_j'(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_j\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{1k}x_k + \beta_1, \dots \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{nk}x_k + \beta_n\right), \qquad 1 \le j \le r,$$

where $\det([\alpha_{jk}]) \ne 0$, and $F' = \{f_j'\}$, then clearly $T(F) = T(F')$: the ticket of a family is not changed by a simultaneous invertible linear change of variables.

If $F = \{f_j\}$, $f_j' = \lambda_j f_j$, where $\lambda_j \ne 0$ and $F' = \{f_j'\}$, then $T(F) = T(F')$. That is, we may normalize the members of a family without affecting its ticket. In particular, if $\sum_j c_j f_j^m = 0$, $c_j \ne 0$, then we may assume without loss of generality that $c_j = \pm 1$ at our convenience. (Of course, we can only do this for *one* such exponent $m \in T(F)$.)

Given $\{f_j\}$ in n variables and n polynomials $\phi_k(y_1, \dots, y_m)$, we can define

$$f'_j(y_1, \dots, y_m) := f_j(\phi_1(y), \dots, \phi_n(y)).$$

Then $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j f_j = 0$ implies $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j f'_j = 0$. It is possible that the f'_j's might not be pairwise non-proportional, but it might also be possible that a judicious choice of ϕ_k will allow for the ticket to be extended. For example, $T(\{x+y, x-y\}) = \emptyset$ and $4xy = (x+y)^2 - (x-y)^2$ is not a square, but if we replace x and y by x^2 and y^2 and add $2xy$ to F, we put 2 into the ticket; c.f., (1.2)(iii).

If $0 \neq g$ is a form, then $T(\{f_j\}) = T(\{gf_j\})$. Thus, $d < d'$ implies that $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(r,n,d')$.

If $n < n'$, then by viewing $f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as a form in $(x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots, x_{n'})$, we see that $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(r,n',d)$.

Regrettably, it is not true that $r < r'$ implies $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(r',n,d)$. For example, $T(\{x,y\}) = \emptyset$, so $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}(2,2,1)$. However, $m = 1$ is forced to be in $T(F)$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(3,2,1)$. (We suspect that the only exceptions to the inclusion $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(r',n,d)$ are consequences of such forcing.)

Here is an outline of the rest of this paper. In section two, we prove our main theoretical result: if $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$, then $|T(F)| \leq \binom{r-1}{2}$. The proof is effective, in that we give an explicit polynomial in $(m, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ which vanishes identically when $m \in T(F)$. This modestly improves Green's $|T(F)| \leq r(r-2)$. In section three, we analyze $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d)$ in the "easy" cases $r \leq 3$, and $(n,d) = (2,1)$ and $(r,n,d) = (4,2,2)$, and discuss $(n,d) = (\geq 3, 1)$. We also show that $\{1,2,3\} \notin \mathcal{T}(4,n,d)$. In section four we work out some concrete tickets. The most dysfunctional family we have found is $F \in \mathcal{F}(2k,2,2)$ for which $|T(F)| = 3k-3$ (and $\overline{m}(F) = 4k-4$.) For each integer a, we give $F_a \in \mathcal{F}(a+2,2,a)$ so that $T(F_a)$ consists precisely of the divisors of a. We also give explicit $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}(6,2,2)$ with $T(F) = \{1,2,8\}$ and $T(F') = \{1,2,3,4,8,14\}$. These generalize (1.1). In fact, for every $v \geq 2$, there is a non-trivial identity equating two sums of the $(3v-1)$-st powers of v binary quadratic forms. We close the paper with generalizations, speculations, open questions and acknowledgments.

2. How long can a ticket be?

In this section we prove that $|T(F)| \leq \binom{r-1}{2}$. The exposition is simplified by assuming that the f_j's are not homogeneous. We assume that $f_j = f_j(x)$, where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, although n does not play an explicit role in the proof. The proof is constructive in that, for each F, we define a polynomial of degree $\binom{r-1}{2}$ in (m,x) which vanishes identically in x whenever $m \in T(F)$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ is a set of polynomials over* $\mathbf{C}$, *no two of which are proportional, with* $\deg(f_j) \leq d$. *Then* $|T(F)| \leq \binom{r-1}{2}$. *If* $d \leq r-3$, *then* $|T(F)| < \binom{r-1}{2}$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ are linearly dependent polynomials and $g_j = \sum_{k\ge 0}(g_j)_k$, where each $(g_j)_k$ is homogeneous of degree k. Then $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j g_j = 0$ implies that $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j (g_j)_k = 0$ for all k. That is,

$$\begin{pmatrix} (g_1)_0 & (g_2)_0 & \cdots & (g_r)_0 \\ (g_1)_1 & (g_2)_1 & \cdots & (g_r)_1 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ (g_1)_{r-1} & (g_2)_{r-1} & \cdots & (g_r)_{r-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_r \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.1}$$

Therefore, as a polynomial in x,

$$W(g_1, \dots, g_r; x) := \begin{vmatrix} (g_1)_0 & (g_2)_0 & \cdots & (g_r)_0 \\ (g_1)_1 & (g_2)_1 & \cdots & (g_r)_1 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ (g_1)_{r-1} & (g_2)_{r-1} & \cdots & (g_r)_{r-1} \end{vmatrix} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

(This Wronskian argument is assuredly not a *sufficient* condition for dependence. Given (2.2), the only null-vectors satisfying (2.1) might well have non-constant components. It might be the case that $\deg(g_j) < r-1$ for all j, rendering (2.2) trivial, and it might happen that $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j g_j$ has terms of degree $\ge r$. Nevertheless, the weak necessary condition (2.2) will suffice for our needs.)

We turn to F. Since f_i/f_j is not constant for $i \ne j$, there exists $k = k(i,j)$ so that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\left(\frac{f_i}{f_j}\right) = f_j^{-2}\left(f_j \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k} - f_i \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_k}\right) \tag{2.3}$$

is not identically zero. For precision, let $k(i,j)$ be the smallest such index. Further, there exists a point $P \in \mathbf{C}^n$ which is *not* contained in the finite union

$$\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^r \{f_j = 0\}\right) \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{1\le i<j\le r} \left\{f_j \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{k(i,j)}} - f_i \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_{k(i,j)}} = 0\right\}\right). \tag{2.4}$$

By translation, we may assume that $P = 0$. If we now let $\gamma_j = (f_j(0))^{-1}$, and replace f_j by $\gamma_j f_j$, then we affect neither the definition of the varieties in (2.4) nor $T(F)$. Accordingly, we may assume without loss of generality that $f_j(0) = 1$ for all j. By evaluating (2.3) at $P = 0$, we see that $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{k(i,j)}}(0) \ne \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_{k(i,j)}}(0)$, hence the first-order terms in the Taylor series of the f_j's at 0 are different. To emphasize this point, we write $(f_j)_1 = L_j$.

We now compute $(f_j^m)_k$ explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} f_j^m &= (1 + L_j + (f_j)_2 + \cdots + (f_j)_d)^m \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\ell_0+\cdots+\ell_d=m \\ \ell_0\ge 0,\dots,\ell_d\ge 0}} \frac{m!}{\ell_0!\dots\ell_d!} 1^{\ell_0} L_j^{\ell_1} ((f_j)_2)^{\ell_2} \dots ((f_j)_d)^{\ell_d}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

and so $(f_j^m)_k$ will consist of those terms from (2.5) in which $\sum_{i=1}^d i\ell_i = k$. After noting that $\ell_0 = m - \sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i$ and writing $(N)_s := \frac{N!}{(N-s)!} = N(N-1)\cdots(N-(s-1))$, we have

$$(f_j^m)_k = \sum_{\substack{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_d \le m \\ \ell_1+\cdots+d\ell_d = k}} \frac{(m)_{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_d}}{\ell_1!\dots\ell_d!} L_j^{\ell_1}((f_j)_2)^{\ell_2}\dots((f_j)_d)^{\ell_d}. \tag{2.6}$$

Consider (2.6) as presenting $(f_j^m)_k$ as a polynomial in m, whose coefficients are polynomials in x. From this perspective, each summand has m-degree $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_d$. This degree is $\le k$, and the maximum is achieved precisely when $\ell_1 = k$ and $\ell_i = 0$, $i \ge 2$. The unique term in $(f_j^m)_k$ with m-degree equal to k is $\frac{L_j^k}{k!}(m)_k$. Thus,

$$(f_j^m)_k = \tfrac{L_j^k}{k!} \cdot m^k + \mathcal{O}_x(m^{k-1}), \qquad 0 \le j \le r-1. \tag{2.7}$$

It is also easy to see that the term in $(f_j^m)_k$ with smallest m-degree occurs when $\ell_d = \lfloor k/d \rfloor$, and all other ℓ_i's vanish, except for $\ell_{k-d\lfloor \frac{k}{d} \rfloor} = 1$, (unless $d \mid k$). Let $u(k,d) := \lfloor \frac{k-1}{d} \rfloor$. This smallest degree is $1 + u(k,d)$ and implies that

$$m(m-1)\cdots(m-u(k,d)) \mid (f_j^m)_k, \qquad 1 \le k \le r-1$$

(More directly, since f_j^m has degree $\le dm$, $(f_j^m)_k = 0$ if $k > md$; that is, if $m \le \frac{k-1}{d}$.) Note that, in particular, $m \mid (f_j^m)_k$ if $k \ge 1$.

We apply (2.2) with $g_j = f_j^m$. Let $W(m;x) := W(f_1^m, \dots, f_r^m; x)$. If $m \in T(F)$, then $W(m;x) = 0$ as a polynomial in x. In view of (2.7), we have

$$W(m;x) = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ L_1 \cdot m & \cdots & L_r \cdot m \\ \frac{L_1^2}{2} \cdot m^2 + \mathcal{O}_x(m) & \cdots & \frac{L_r^2}{2} \cdot m^2 + \mathcal{O}_x(m) \\ \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ \frac{L_1^{r-1}}{(r-1)!} \cdot m^{r-1} + \mathcal{O}_x(m^{r-2}) & \cdots & \frac{L_{r-1}^{r}}{(r-1)!} \cdot m^{r-1} + \mathcal{O}_x(m^{r-2}) \end{vmatrix}. \tag{2.8}$$

Then $W(m;x)$ has m-degree $\le \binom{r}{2}$, and the coefficient of $m^{\binom{r}{2}}$ is the Vandermonde determinant

$$\tfrac{1}{2!\cdots(r-1)!} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ L_1(x) & \cdots & L_r(x) \\ . & \ddots & \cdots \\ L_1^{r-1}(x) & \cdots & L_r^{r-1}(x) \end{vmatrix} = \tfrac{1}{2!\cdots(r-1)!} \prod_{1 \le i < j \le r} \left(L_j(x) - L_i(x)\right).$$

Since the L_j's are distinct linear forms, there exists $y \in \mathbf{C}^n$ so that $L_i(y) \neq L_j(y)$ for $i \neq j$. Thus, $W(m;y)$ is a polynomial in m of exact degree $\binom{r}{2}$. Since m^{r-1} is a factor, $W(m;y)$ can have at most $\binom{r}{2} - (r-1) = \binom{r-1}{2}$ distinct positive integer roots, and these contain $T(F)$.

Moreover, the k-th row of (2.8) is divisible by $(m)_{1+u(k-1,d)}$, hence $W(m;y)$ has a factor of

$$\prod_{k=0}^{r-1} (m)_{1+u(k,d)} = \prod_{k=0}^{r-1} m(m-1)\dots(m-u(k,d)) = \prod_{i=0}^{u(r-1,d)} (m-i)^{r-id-1}.$$

In particular, if $d \le r-3$, then $m^{r-1}(m-1)^2$ divides $W(m;y)$, so $|T(F)| < \binom{r-1}{2}$. Indeed, if $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$, then

$$|T(F)| \le \binom{r}{2} - (r-1) - \sum_{i=1}^{u(r-1,d)} (r-2-id).$$

If $d = 2$, this bound works out to be $\lfloor r^2/4 \rfloor - 1$. For larger d it is $\approx \left(\frac{d-1}{2d}\right) r^2$. $\square$

If $r = 3$, then $|T(F)| \le 1$; see Theorem 3 below.

If $r = 4$, then $|T(F)| \le 3$, and the bound is achieved in (1.1). Example 5 will discuss $F \in \mathcal{T}(4,2,2)$ with $T(F) = \{1,2,4\}$. Theorem 5 will show that there is no family in any $\mathcal{F}(4,n,d)$ for which $T(F) = \{1,2,3\}$. (However, by Theorem 2, this is the ticket for any $F \in \mathcal{F}(5,2,1)$.)

Theorem 1 gives an algorithm for computing the ticket of a given family: once a finite set of candidate exponents is found, the dependence of the f_j^m's can be checked.

If $(n,d) = (1,2)$ and $r = 4$, then (2.5) becomes explicitly

$$\begin{aligned}(1+at+bt^2)^m &= 1 + mat + \left(\tfrac{m(m-1)}{2}a^2 + mb\right)t^2 \\ &+ \left(\tfrac{m(m-1)(m-2)}{6}a^3 + m(m-1)ab\right)t^3 + \dots,\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

(Note the factor of $(m)_0$ in $(f^m)_1$ and $(f^m)_2$, and the factor of $(m)_1$ in $(f^m)_3$.) After substituting (2.9) into (2.2) for $f_j(t) = 1 + a_jt + b_jt^2$, $1 \le j \le 4$, and taking common factors out of the rows, we find that

$$W(m;t) = \frac{m^3(m-1)}{12} t^6 \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ a_1 & \dots & a_4 \\ (m-1)a_1^2 + 2b_1 & \dots & (m-1)a_4^2 + 2b_4 \\ (m-2)a_1^3 + 6a_1b_1 & \dots & (m-2)a_4^3 + 6a_4b_4 \end{vmatrix}. \tag{2.10}$$

Let $W'(m)$ denote the determinant in (2.10); if $1 \neq m_0 \in T(F)$, then $W'(m_0) = 0$.

Example 1 (Part Two).

We can dehomogenize (1.1) by setting $(x,y)\mapsto(1,t)$ and normalizing so that $f_j(0)=1$. This gives

$$f_1(t)=1+\sqrt{2}\,t-t^2,\qquad f_2(t)=1+i\sqrt{2}\,t+t^2,$$
$$f_3(t)=1-\sqrt{2}\,t-t^2,\qquad f_4(t)=1-i\sqrt{2}\,t+t^2. \tag{2.11}$$

Taking $a_j=i^{j-1}\sqrt{2}$ and $b_j=(-1)^j$ in (2.10), we obtain

$$W'(m)=\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1\\ \sqrt{2} & i\sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} & -i\sqrt{2}\\ 2(m-2) & -2(m-2) & 2(m-2) & -2(m-2)\\ 2\sqrt{2}(m-5) & -2i\sqrt{2}(m-5) & -2\sqrt{2}(m-5) & 2i\sqrt{2}(m-5)\end{vmatrix}$$
$$=-128i(m-2)(m-5).$$

Thus, $W'(m)=0$ only for $m=2,5$. Remarkably, each root corresponds to a linear dependence among the $\{f_j^m\}$. If we replace $\sqrt{2}$ in (2.11) by a parameter $\mu>0$, then the roots of $W'(m)$ work out to be $m=1+2\mu^{-2}$, and $m=2+6\mu^{-2}$. We shall show in Example 1 (Part Three) that, apart from $\mu=\sqrt{2}$, these roots correspond to linear dependence only when $(\mu,m)=(\sqrt{6},3)$ and $(\sqrt{2/3},4)$.

3. $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d)$ FOR SMALL r, n, d

In this section, we describe $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d)$ in some simple cases.

a. $(n,d)=(2,1)$**.**

It is very easy to show that $\mathcal{T}(2,1,r)=\{1,2,\dots,r-2\}$. If $m\le r-2$, then $r>\binom{2+m\cdot 1-1}{2-1}=m+1$, hence $m\in T(F)$ is forced. Suppose $m=r-1$ and write $f_j(x,y)=\alpha_jx+\beta_jy$ for $1\le j\le r$. Then the matrix giving f_j^{r-1} with respect to the basis $\binom{r-1}{\ell}x^{r-1-\ell}y^\ell$, for $0\le\ell\le r-1$, has Vandermonde determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1^{r-1} & \alpha_1^{r-2}\beta_1 & \dots & \beta_1^{r-1}\\ \alpha_2^{r-1} & \alpha_2^{r-2}\beta_2 & \dots & \beta_2^{r-1}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \alpha_r^{r-1} & \alpha_r^{r-2}\beta_r & \dots & \beta_r^{r-1}\end{vmatrix}=\prod_{i<j}(\alpha_i\beta_j-\alpha_j\beta_i)\neq 0,$$

since the f_j's are pairwise non-proportional. It follows that $r-1\notin T(F)$. If $m\ge r$, then take $f_j(x,y)=\alpha_jx+\beta_jy$ for $r+1\le j\le m+1$ so that $F':=F\cup\{f_{r+1},\dots,f_{m+1}\}$ consists of pairwise non-proportional forms. Since $m\notin T(F')$, $m\notin T(F)$.

b. $(n,d)=(\ge 3,1)$**.**

It follows from the last section that $\{1,\dots,r-2\}\in\mathcal{T}(r,n,1)$ for $n\ge 3$. Are there other tickets? We need a simple lemma.

Lemma 1. *Suppose*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} \lambda_j \left(\alpha_{j1}x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{jn}x_n\right)^m = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Then for every $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbf{C}^n$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} \lambda_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_{jk}\gamma_k\right) \left(\alpha_{j1}x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{jn}x_n\right)^{m-1} = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Apply the differential operator $\frac{1}{m}\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \gamma_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}$ to both sides of (3.1). $\square$

Lemma 2.

(i) If $m \in T(F)$ *for* $F \in \mathcal{F}(r, n, 1)$*, then* $m - 1 \in T(F)$*.*

(ii) If $F \in \mathcal{F}(r, n, 1)$*, then* $\overline{m}(F) \le r - 2$*.*

Proof. (i) If $m \in T(F)$, then some equation (3.1) holds, where, say, $\lambda_{j_0} \ne 0$. Since $f_{j_0} \ne 0$, there exists ℓ so that $\lambda_{j_0}\alpha_{j_0\ell} \ne 0$. Now differentiate (3.1) with respect to x_ℓ; (3.2) implies that $m - 1 \in T(F)$.

(ii) Suppose (3.1) holds. We claim by induction on m that $m \le r - 2$. If $m = 1$, then the assumption that the forms are pairwise non-proportional implies that $r \ge 3$. Suppose now that the claim is true for $m - 1$. There exists γ so that $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_{rk}\gamma_k = 0$, but $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_{jk}\gamma_k \ne 0$ (as α_j is not proportional to α_r) and so the summand in (3.2) for $j = r$ disappears. By induction, $m - 1 \le r - 3$, so $m \le r - 2$. $\square$

If $r > \binom{n+m-1}{n-1}$, then $\{1, \dots, m\}$ is forced to be in $T(F)$. Let $m(r, n)$ denote the largest integer m so that $r > \binom{n+m-1}{n-1}$, and note that $m(r, 2) = r - 2$. We have established the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *If* $F \in \mathcal{F}(r, n, 1)$*, then* $T(F) = \{1, \dots, k\}$*, where* $m(r, n) \le k \le m - 2$*.*

Example 3.

Fix (r, n) and let $m = m(r, n)$, so that $\binom{n+m}{n-1} \ge r > \binom{n+m-1}{n-1}$. By Biermann's Theorem (see [11, p.31]),

$$\{(i_1x_1 + \cdots + i_nx_n)^{m+1} : 0 \le i_k \in \mathbf{Z},\ i_1 + \cdots + i_n = m + 1\} \tag{3.3}$$

is a linearly independent set with $\binom{n+m}{n-1} \ge r$ elements. Let F be any subset of r of the linear forms in (3.3). Then $m + 1 \notin T(F)$, but $\{1, \dots, m\}$ is forced to be in $T(F)$. Thus $T(F)$ is precisely $\{1, \dots, m(r, n)\}$.

We strongly suspect that every ticket allowed by Theorem 2 is achieved, since the extremes appear. We also strongly suspect that a proof of this result is not difficult.

An alternative presentation of the foregoing can be made using "Serret's Theorem" (see [1] or [11, p.26]): given $\alpha_j \in \mathbf{C}^n$, $1 \le j \le r$, $\alpha_j = (\alpha_{j1}, \dots, \alpha_{jn})$, the forms $\{(\sum_k \alpha_{jk} x_k)^m\}$ are linearly independent if and only if there exist "dual" forms $h_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of degree m so that $h_i(\alpha_j) = 0$ if $i \ne j$, but $h_i(\alpha_i) \ne 0$. Theorem 2 in [1] implies Lemma 3.2(ii).

c. $r \le 3$**.**

These two cases are easily analyzed.

Theorem 3.

(i) $\mathcal{T}\{2, n, d\} = \{\emptyset\}$*;*

(ii) $\mathcal{T}\{3, 2, 1\} = \{\{1\}\}$*;*

(iii) $\mathcal{T}\{3, n, 1\} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$*, if* $n \ge 3$*;*

(iv) $\mathcal{T}\{3, n, d\} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}\}$*, if* $d \ge 2$*.*

Proof. First, if $r = 2$, $0 = \lambda_1 f_1^m + \lambda_2 f_2^m$ and $\lambda \ne (0, 0)$, then f_1 and f_2 are proportional. If $r = 3$ and $d = 1$, then Theorem 2 and Example 3 imply (ii) and (iii). In any event, Theorem 1 implies that $|T(F)| \le 1$, "Fermat's Last Theorem" implies that $\overline{m}(F) \le 2$ and (1.2)(iii) given $T(F) = \{2\}$. $\square$

d. $(r, n, d) = (4, 2, 2)$**.**

The simplest remaining case is $(r, n, d) = (4, 2, 2)$. The heavy lifting for this is done in the forthcoming [12], which determines all families $F \in \mathcal{F}(4, 2, 2)$ for which $3 \le m \in T(F)$. Since $4 > \binom{2+2-1}{2-1}$, 1 is forced, and $|T(F)| \le 3$ by Theorem 1.

If $T(F) \subseteq \{1, 2\}$, then the possibilities are $\{1\}$ or $\{1, 2\}$. These are achieved, respectively by

$$\{x^2, y^2, (x+y)^2, (x-y)^2\}, \qquad \{x^2, y^2, x^2+y^2, x^2-y^2\}.$$

Suppose $m \in T(F)$ with $m \ge 3$. Then we may scale so that

$$f_1^m + f_2^m = f_3^m + f_4^m, \qquad m \ge 3. \tag{3.4}$$

is an equation in binary quadratic forms. Write the common sum in (3.4) as p, then $p \ne 0$, $\{f_1^m, f_2^m\} \ne \{f_3^m, f_4^m\}$, and there do not exist $\alpha_j \in \mathbf{C}$ and $g \in \mathbf{C}[x, y]$ so that $\alpha_1^m + \alpha_2^m = \alpha_3^m + \alpha_4^m$ and $f_j = \alpha_j g$. This is the equation studied in [12], where the uniqueness assertions in the rest of this subsection are established. (Uniqueness is taken up to invertible linear changes of variable.)

Example 4.

For $m = 3$, the solutions to (3.4) satisfying the non-triviality conditions come from a single one-parameter family, first given, in a different form, by J. Young in 1832 (see [3, p.554]). For $\alpha \notin \{0, 1, -1\}$ and $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, y) &= \alpha x^2 - xy + \alpha y^2, \qquad & f_2(x, y) &= -x^2 + \alpha xy - y^2, \\ f_3(x, y) &= \omega\alpha x^2 - xy + \omega^2 \alpha y^2, \qquad & f_4(x, y) &= -\omega x^2 + \alpha xy - \omega^2 y^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Then

$$f_1^3(x,y) + \alpha f_2^3(x,y) = f_3^3(x,y) + \alpha f_4^3(x,y), \tag{3.6}$$

and it is not hard to show that $T(\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4\}) = \{1, 3\}$ for every α. (It is also true that ω and ω^2 can be permuted in f_3 and f_4, giving a third pair of cubes in (3.6) with the same sum.)

For $m = 4$, there are two solutions to (3.4) satisfying the non-triviality condition.

Example 5.

First, let

$$\begin{gathered} f_1(x,y) = x^2 + y^2, \qquad f_2(x,y) = \omega x^2 + \omega^2 y^2, \qquad f_3(x,y) = \omega^2 x^2 + \omega y^2, \\ f_4(x,y) = xy. \end{gathered} \tag{3.7}$$

Then it is easy to verify that

$$f_1 + f_2 + f_3 = 0, \quad f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 = 6f_4^2, \quad f_1^4 + f_2^4 + f_3^4 = 18f_4^4.$$

It follows from Theorem 1 that $T(\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4\}) = \{1, 2, 4\}$. The "obvious" generalization of (3.7) is presented in Example 8.

After taking the linear transformation $(x, y) \mapsto (i(x - \omega y), x - \omega^2 y)$ in (3.7) and scaling, we obtain an integral version of F,

$$\begin{gathered} f_1(x,y) = x^2 + 2xy, \qquad f_2(x,y) = x^2 - y^2, \\ f_3(x,y) = 2xy + y^2, \qquad f_4(x,y) = x^2 + xy + y^2. \end{gathered} \tag{3.8}$$

Example 6.

The other solution to (3.4) for $m = 4$ gives a family with ticket $\{1, 4\}$:

$$\sum_{\pm} (\sqrt{3}\, x^2 \pm \sqrt{2}\, xy - \sqrt{3}\, y^2)^4 = \sum_{\pm} (\sqrt{3}\, x^2 \pm i\sqrt{2}\, xy + \sqrt{3}\, y^2)^4; \tag{3.9}$$

This example corresponds to $(\mu, m) = (\sqrt{2/3}, 4)$ in Example 1 (Part Two).

Finally, (1.1) gives the unique solution to (3.4) when $m = 5$.

We summarize this discussion with a result whose proof relies on [12].

Theorem 4.

$$\mathcal{T}(4, 2, 2) = \{\{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 5\}\}.$$

As d increases, so does $\mathcal{T}(4, 2, d)$. Example 13 shows that $\{3\} \in \mathcal{T}(4, 2, 4)$; Example 14 shows that $\{4\} \in \mathcal{T}(4, 2, 7)$.

e. $\{(1,2,3)\} \notin \mathcal{T}(4,n,d)$.

We close this section with a non-existence theorem.

Lemma 3. *Suppose* $\{f_j\} \in \mathcal{F}(r,n,d)$ *is two-dimensional; that is, there exist* f *and* g*, not proportional, so that* $f_j = \alpha_j f + \beta_j g$, $1 \le j \le r$. *If* $f_j' = \alpha_j x + \beta_j y$*, then* $T(\{f_j\}) = T(\{f_j'\})$. *In particular,* $T(\{f_j\}) \subseteq \{1,\dots,r-2\}$.

Proof. One inclusion is obvious. For the other, since no two f_j's are proportional, the same can be said about the (α_j,β_j)'s. Suppose $\sum_j \lambda_j f_j^m = 0$ and let $P(x,y) = \sum_j \lambda_j(\alpha_j x + \beta_j y)^m$, so that $0 = P(f,g)$. If $P = 0$, then $m \in T(\{f_j'\})$. Otherwise, P splits into non-trivial linear factors, and $0 = \prod_i(\gamma_i f - \delta_i g)$ implies that f and g are proportional, a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 5. *For every* (n,d), $\{1,2,3\} \notin \mathcal{T}(4,n,d)$.

Proof. Let $F = \{f_1,f_2,f_3,f_4\}$ and suppose there are three non-trivial equations

$$0 = \lambda_{11}f_1 + \lambda_{12}f_2 + \lambda_{13}f_3 + \lambda_{14}f_4, \tag{3.10)(i}$$

$$0 = \lambda_{21}f_1^2 + \lambda_{22}f_2^2 + \lambda_{23}f_3^2 + \lambda_{24}f_4^2, \tag{3.10)(ii}$$

$$0 = \lambda_{31}f_1^3 + \lambda_{32}f_2^3 + \lambda_{33}f_3^3 + \lambda_{34}f_4^3. \tag{3.10)(iii}$$

If the f_j's were to satisfy a linear relation different from (3.10)(i), then Lemma 3 would imply $3 \notin T(F)$. Also, Theorem 3 implies that $\lambda_{3j} \ne 0$ for all j.

Suppose first that one of λ_{1k}'s equals zero, say $\lambda_{14} = 0$. Then after scaling the f_j's, we can assume that $f_1 + f_2 = f_3$, and by Theorem 1 with $r = 3$, $\lambda_{24} \ne 0$. Thus, after dividing by $\lambda_{\ell 4}$, and relabeling, (3.10)(ii) and (3.10)(iii) imply that

$$\beta_{21}f_1^2 + \beta_{22}f_2^2 + \beta_{23}(f_1+f_2)^2 = f_4^2, \tag{3.11)(i}$$

$$\beta_{31}f_1^3 + \beta_{32}f_2^3 + \beta_{33}(f_1+f_2)^3 = f_4^3. \tag{3.11)(ii}$$

If $\beta_{21}u^2 + \beta_{22}v^2 + \beta_{23}(u+v)^2$ were a perfect square, then (3.11)(i) would imply a linear relation among f_1, f_2 and f_4, different from (3.10)(i), and as noted above, this would be a contradiction. However, (3.11) implies that

$$\left(\beta_{21}f_1^2 + \beta_{22}f_2^2 + \beta_{23}(f_1+f_2)^2\right)^3 = \left(\beta_{31}f_1^3 + \beta_{32}f_2^3 + \beta_{33}(f_1+f_2)^3\right)^2; \tag{3.12}$$

since f_1 and f_2 are not proportional, (3.12) and the argument of Lemma 3 imply that

$$\left(\beta_{21}u^2 + \beta_{22}v^2 + \beta_{23}(u+v)^2\right)^3 = \left(\beta_{31}u^3 + \beta_{32}v^3 + \beta_{33}(u+v)^3\right)^2. \tag{3.13}$$

But if $\Phi = F^3 = G^2$, then any irreducible factor of Φ must occur to the sixth power. Thus, (3.13) implies that $\beta_{21}u^2 + \beta_{22}v^2 + \beta_{23}(u+v)^2$ is a square, a contradiction.

Therefore, we may assume that $\lambda_{1k} \neq 0$, and so after scaling, $f_4 = f_1 + f_2 + f_3$ and

$$\beta_{21} f_1^2 + \beta_{22} f_2^2 + \beta_{23} f_3^2 + \beta_{24}(f_1 + f_2 + f_3)^2 = 0, \tag{3.14)(i}$$

$$\beta_{31} f_1^3 + \beta_{32} f_2^3 + \beta_{33} f_3^3 + \beta_{24}(f_1 + f_2 + f_3)^3 = 0. \tag{3.14)(ii}$$

By Bezout's Theorem, the intersection of the two curves

$$\begin{aligned} G_2(u,v,w) &:= \beta_{21}u^2 + \beta_{22}v^2 + \beta_{23}w^2 + \beta_{24}(u+v+w)^2 = 0, \\ G_3(u,v,w) &:= \beta_{31}u^3 + \beta_{32}v^3 + \beta_{33}w^3 + \beta_{34}(u+v+w)^3 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

is at most six lines, unless the curves share a component. Since (f_1, f_2, f_3) parameterizes the intersection by (3.14), either $G_2 \mid G_3$ or both share a linear factor ℓ. However, if $G_2 = \ell_1 \ell_2$ for linear ℓ_j, then $G_2(f_1, f_2, f_3) = 0$ implies that $\ell_j(f_1, f_2, f_3) = 0$ for some j; this is different from $f_4 = f_1 + f_2 + f_3$ and gives a contradiction as before.

The only remaining possibility is that $G_2 \mid G_3$ and G_2 is irreducible. After relabeling once again, we see that this case is

$$\begin{gathered} \left(\sigma_1 u^2 + \sigma_2 v^2 + \sigma_3 w^2 + 2\sigma_4(uv + uw + vw)\right)\left(\gamma_1 u + \gamma_2 v + \gamma_3 w\right) \\ = \tau_1 u^3 + \tau_2 v^3 + \tau_3 w^3 + \\ \tau_4(3u^2v + 3uv^2 + 3uw^2 + 6uvw + 3uw^2 + 3v^2w + 3vw^2). \end{gathered} \tag{3.15}$$

Since $\beta_{3j} \neq 0$, we may assume in (3.15) that $\tau_4 \neq 0$ (hence $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) \neq (0,0,0)$) and that $\tau_j \neq \tau_4$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. By considering the coefficients of $u^2v, u^2w, uv^2, v^2w, uw^2, vw^2$ and uvw in (3.15), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} 3\tau_4 &= 2\gamma_1\sigma_4 + \gamma_2\sigma_1 = 2\gamma_1\sigma_4 + \gamma_3\sigma_1 = 2\gamma_2\sigma_4 + \gamma_1\sigma_2 = 2\gamma_2\sigma_4 + \gamma_3\sigma_2 \\ &= 2\gamma_3\sigma_4 + \gamma_1\sigma_3 = 2\gamma_3\sigma_4 + \gamma_2\sigma_3 = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3)\sigma_4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Since $\tau_4 \neq 0$, it follows that $\sigma_4 \neq 0$. Further, it follows immediately from (3.16) that

$$0 = (\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)\sigma_1 = (\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)\sigma_2 = (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\sigma_3. \tag{3.17}$$

If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 := \gamma \neq 0$, then (3.16) reduces to

$$3\tau_4 = \gamma(\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4) = \gamma(\sigma_2 + 2\sigma_4) = \gamma(\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_4) = 3\gamma\sigma_4.$$

This implies that $\sigma = \sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = \sigma_4 := \sigma$, so $G_2(u,v,w) = (u+v+w)^2$, a contradiction.

If the γ_j's are not all equal, then after permutation of indices if necessary, we may assume that $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$ and $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_3$, hence $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 0$ by (3.17). Then (3.16) becomes

$$3\tau_4 = 2\gamma_1\sigma_4 + \gamma_2\sigma_1 = 2\gamma_1\sigma_4 + \gamma_3\sigma_1 = 2\gamma_2\sigma_4 = 2\gamma_3\sigma_4 = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3)\sigma_4.$$

Thus $\gamma_2 = \gamma_3$, and so $2\gamma_2\sigma_4 = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3)\sigma_4$ implies $\gamma_1 = 0$. It then follows that $\sigma_1 = 2\sigma_4$, hence $G_2(u,v,w) = 2\sigma_4(u+v)(u+w)$, a final contradiction. □

4. A few interesting tickets

The examples in this section indicate some of the range of $\mathcal{T}$, and are inspired, for the most part, by the examples from [12]. The families mostly have $n = 2$, consist of binomials or highly symmetric trinomials, and rely on the properties of roots of unity.

Example 8 presents highly dysfunctional families $F \in \mathcal{F}(2v+2,2,2)$ with $|T(F)| = 3v$. Example 9 gives families $F \in \mathcal{F}(r,2,2)$ so that $T(F)$ contains $\{1,\dots,r-2\}$ as well as $r+s$, for any single integer s, $2 \le s \le r-1$. This is less dysfunctional than the previous example, but with a larger jump. The families in Example 10 are not dysfunctional, but have an even larger jump; for example, $\{1,2,8\} \in \mathcal{T}(6,2,2)$. One special case combines Examples 9 and 10 to show that $\{1,2,3,4,8,14\} \in \mathcal{T}(6,2,2)$. Example 11 presents $F \in \mathcal{F}(a+2,2,a)$ so that $T(F)$ consists precisely of the divisors of a. Example 12, essentially due to Molluzzo, shows that $\overline{m}_r \ge \lfloor \frac{(r-1)^2}{4} \rfloor$ and also shows some dysfunctionality. Finally, Examples 13 and 14 are variations of two families due to L. Euler showing that $\{3\} \in \mathcal{T}(4,2,4)$ and $\{4\} \in \mathcal{T}(4,2,7)$.

We first need some elementary observations about roots of unity. Write $\zeta_q = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{q}}$ for integral $q \ge 2$. We shall say that $\{f_0,\dots,f_{q-1}\}$ is *q-cyclotomic* on $\{g_0,\dots,g_{q-1}\}$ if

$$f_j = \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} \zeta_q^{jk} g_k, \qquad 0 \le j \le q-1, \tag{4.1}$$

and the g_k's involve disjoint sets of monomials. If $\{f_j\}$ is q-cyclotomic on $\{g_k\}$, then $\{f_j^m\}$ is q-cyclotomic on $\{g_{m,k}\}$, where

$$g_{m,k} = \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_m \equiv k \mod q \\ 0 \le i_k \le q-1}} g_{i_1}\cdots g_{i_m}, \tag{4.2}$$

provided the $g_{m,k}$'s involve disjoint monomials.

Lemma 4. *If $\{f_0,\dots,f_{q-1}\}$ is q-cyclotomic on $\{g_0,\dots,g_{q-1}\}$, then*

$$\mathit{Span}(f_0,\dots,f_{q-1}) = \mathit{Span}(g_0,\dots,g_{q-1}).$$

In particular, $\{f_j\}$ is linearly dependent if and only if some $g_k = 0$.

Proof. By the orthogonality properties of roots of unity, (4.1) inverts to

$$g_\ell = \frac{1}{q}\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \zeta_q^{-j\ell} f_j, \qquad 0 \le \ell \le q-1. \tag{4.3}$$

Since the g_k's involve different monomials, they can only be trivially dependent. □

Example 1 (Part Three).

Continuing the discussion in Example 1 (Part Two), suppose

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(t) &= 1 + \mu t - t^2, \qquad & f_2(t) &= 1 + i\mu t + t^2, \\ f_3(t) &= 1 - \mu t - t^2, \qquad & f_4(t) &= 1 - i\mu t + t^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

That is, F is 4-cyclotomic on $\{1, \mu t, -t^2, 0\}$. To ensure pairwise non-proportionality in (4.4), we require $\mu \neq 0$. Suppose $1 < m \in T(F)$. Then it follows from Lemma 4 that $g_{m,k} = 0$ for some k. But for $m > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{m,0} &= 1 + \dots, \qquad & g_{m,1} &= m\mu t + \dots, \\ g_{2v+1,2} &= \dots + t^{4v+2}, \qquad & g_{2v,3} &= \dots - 2v\mu t^{4v-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and since these $g_{m,k}$'s all have at least one non-zero term, the only $g_{m,k}$'s which can vanish are $g_{2v,2}$ and $g_{2v+1,3}$. We have

$$\begin{gathered} g_{2,2}(t) = (\mu^2 - 2)t^2, \qquad g_{3,3}(t) = (\mu^3 - 6\mu)t^3, \\ g_{4,2}(t) = (6\mu^2 - 4)(t^2 + t^6), \qquad g_{5,3}(t) = (10\mu^3 - 20\mu)(t^3 + t^7), \\ g_{6,2}(t) = (15\mu^2 - 6)t^2 + (\mu^6 - 30\mu^4 + 90\mu^2 - 20)t^6 + (15\mu^2 - 6)t^{10}, \\ g_{7,3}(t) = (35\mu^3 - 42\mu)t^3 + (\mu^7 - 42\mu^5 + 210\mu^3 - 140\mu)t^7 + (35\mu^3 - 42\mu)t^{11}. \end{gathered} \tag{4.5}$$

We see from (4.5) that $g_{m,k} = 0$ for $m \leq 7$ only if $(\mu, m) = (\sqrt{2}, 2), (\sqrt{6}, 3), (\sqrt{2/3}, 4)$ or $(\sqrt{2}, 5)$. (It is evident that $m = 6, 7$ yield nothing useful; Green's Theorem implies that we need only check $m \leq 8$; the computation of $g_{8,2}$ is left to the reader.)

We've seen that for $\mu = \sqrt{2}$, F is equivalent to (1.1). (This includes the seemingly accidental $g_{2,2} \mid g_{5,3}$.) If $\mu = \sqrt{6}$, then after homogenizing and inverting by (4.2), we obtain the identity

$$\begin{gathered} 6\sqrt{6}(x^5y + xy^5) = \\ (x^2 + \sqrt{6}xy - y^2)^3 - (-x^2\sqrt{6}xy + y^2)^3 \\ = (ix^2 - \sqrt{6}xy + iy^2)^3 - (ix^2 + \sqrt{6}xy + iy^2)^3 \end{gathered} \tag{4.6}$$

It happens that $6\sqrt{6}(x^5y + xy^5)$ has four other representations as a sum of two cubes, involving 24-th roots of unity; (4.6) is derivable from (3.5) after an unpleasant change of variables and choice of α. If $\mu = \sqrt{2/3}$, then after homogenizing and inverting, we obtain (3.9).

Example 7.

Let $f_j(x,y) = x + \zeta_q^j y$. Then $\{f_j^m\}$ is q-cyclotomic on $\{g_{m,0},\dots,g_{m,q-1}\}$, where

$$g_{m,k}(x,y) = \sum_{\substack{i\equiv k \mod q \\ 0\le i\le m}} \binom{m}{i} x^{m-i}y^i.$$

Thus $g_{m,q-1} = 0$ if $m < q-1$, hence $\{f_j^m\}$ is linearly dependent and so $m \in T(F)$, and $g_{m,k} \ne 0$ if $m \ge q-1$, so $m \notin T(F)$. This is just a special case of Theorem 2.

Example 8.

Suppose q is odd and let $f_j(x,y) = \zeta_q^j x^2 + \zeta_q^{-j} y^2$. (Since q is odd, no two f_j's are proportional.) Then

$$f_j^m(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \binom{m}{i} \zeta_q^{(m-2i)j} x^{2m-2i}y^{2i},$$

so

$$g_{m,k}(x,y) = \sum_{\substack{m-2i\equiv k \mod q \\ 0\le i\le m}} \binom{m}{i} x^{2m-2i}y^{2i}. \tag{4.7}$$

Now let

$$F_q = \{f_0(x,y),\dots,f_{q-1}(x,y),xy\}.$$

(Without xy, we are essentially in Example 7.) By Lemma 4,

$$\mathrm{Span}(f_0^m,\dots,f_{q-1}^m,(xy)^m) = \mathrm{Span}(g_{m,0},\dots,g_{m,q-1},(xy)^m). \tag{4.8}$$

It follows from (4.8) that $m \in T(F_q)$ if and only if either $g_{m,i} = 0$ for some i or $g_{m,i}$ is a multiple of $(xy)^m$.

In the first case, $m - 2i \equiv k \mod q$ is always soluble mod q, so if $m \ge q-1$, then there will exist i, $0 \le i \le m$, satisfying the congruence, and $g_{m,i} \ne 0$. On the other hand, if $m \le q-2$, then the equation $m - 2i \equiv m + 2 \mod q$ implies that $i \equiv q-1$ mod q, hence $g_{m,m+2} = 0$. Therefore, $T(F_q)$ contains $\{1,\dots,q-2\}$. (Alternatively, $f_j(x,y) = g_j(x^2,y^2)$ for linear g_j, and $m \le q-2$ is forced in $T(\{g_j\})$.)

In the second case, $(xy)^m$ can only occur in $g_{m,i}$ if m is even, $i = m/2$ and $k = 0$. Putting this into (4.7), we see that $(xy)^m$ is the only term in $g_{m,0}$ if and only if $i = m/2$ is the only solution to $2i \equiv m \mod q$ with $0 \le i \le m$, and this occurs if and only if $m/2 < q$; that is, $m < 2q$. Thus $T(F_q)$ contains the even integers $\{2,\dots,2q-2\}$. Writing $q = 2v+1$, we see that $r = |F_q| = 2v+2$ and

$$T(F_{2v+1}) = \{1,3,\dots,2v-1\} \cup \{2,4,\dots,4v\} = \{1,2,\dots,2v-1,2v,2v+2,\dots 4v\}.$$

so that $|T(F_{2v+1})| = 3v = \frac{3}{2}r - 3$. For example, (3.8) is F_3. The explicit linear relations are not very interesting:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \left(\zeta_q^j x^2 + \zeta_q^{-j} y^2\right)^m = 0, \qquad \text{if } m < q \text{ is odd;}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \left(\zeta_q^j x^2 + \zeta_q^{-j} y^2\right)^m = q\binom{m}{m/2}(xy)^m, \qquad \text{if } m < 2q \text{ is even.}$$

Example 9.

This next example is a variation on Example 8, giving a smaller ticket, but one with a larger gap. We no longer assume that q is odd. Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{C}$, and let

$$f_{j,q,\alpha}(x,y) = \zeta_q^j x^2 + \alpha xy + \zeta_q^{-j} y^2, \qquad 0 \le j \le q-1, \tag{4.9}$$

and let

$$F_{q,\alpha} = \{f_{0,q,\alpha}(x,y), \dots, f_{q-1,q,\alpha}(x,y), xy\}.$$

Since

$$\left(\zeta_q^j x^2 + \alpha xy + \zeta_q^{-j} y^2\right)^m = \sum_{\substack{a+b+c=m \\ a,b,c \ge 0}} \frac{m!}{a!b!c!} \zeta_q^{j(a-c)} \alpha^b x^{2a+b} y^{b+2c},$$

by setting $b = m - a - c$ above, we see that

$$g_{m,k}(x,y) = \sum_{\substack{a-c \equiv k \mod q \\ 0 \le a,c,m-(a+c)}} \frac{m!}{a!c!(m-a-c)!} \alpha^{m-a-c} x^{m+(a-c)} y^{m-(a-c)}. \tag{4.10}$$

Again, $m \in T(F_{q,\alpha})$ if and only if $g_{m,k} = 0$ or is a multiple of $(xy)^m$. The complication here is that the coefficient of a monomial in $g_{m,k}$ is a polynomial in α, and may vanish when α is suitably chosen. If $m \le q-1$, then $a \equiv c \mod q$ and $m \ge |a-c|$ imply that $a = c$ so that (4.10) becomes

$$g_{m,0}(x,y) = \left(\sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \frac{m!}{(a!)^2(m-2a)!} \alpha^{m-2a}\right) x^m y^m,$$

and $m \in T(F_{q,\alpha})$. Suppose now that $q \ge 3$ and $m = q+s$, $2 \le s \le q-1$. We fix $k = 0$. Then $a - c \equiv 0 \mod q$ implies that $a - c \in \{-q, 0, q\}$ and by (4.10),

$$g_{q+s,0}(x,y) =$$

$$\left(\sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor} \frac{(q+s)!}{a!(a+q)!(s-2a)!} \alpha^{s-2a}\right)(x^{s+2q}y^s + x^s y^{s+2q}) + B(\alpha)(xy)^{s+q}. \tag{4.11}$$

Since $s \ge 2$, there exists $\alpha = \alpha_0$ which kills the coefficient of $x^{s+2q}y^s + x^s y^{s+2q}$ in (4.11), so that $g_{q+s,0}$ is a multiple of $(xy)^{s+q}$. In this case,

$$\{1, \dots, q-1, q+s\} \subseteq T(F_{q,\alpha_0}).$$

We cannot rule out the possibility that $T(F_{q,\alpha_0})$ has other elements, if α_0 is a root of other polynomials appearing in different $g_{m.k}$'s. Unless that happens, we have $|F_{q,\alpha_0}| = q+1$ and if $s = q-1$ is maximal, then $\overline{m}(F_{q,\alpha_0}) \ge q+s = 2q-1$. Thus, $\overline{m}_r \ge 2r-3$, and this is larger than $\lfloor \frac{(r-1)^2}{4} \rfloor$ for $r \le 8$. The stronger bound $\overline{m}_6 \ge 14$ is shown in (4.16).

The simplest concrete example is $q = 3$ and $m = 5$. We have $\zeta_3 = \omega$ and (4.11) becomes

$$g_{5,0} = (5 + 10\alpha^2)(x^8y^2 + x^2y^8).$$

Taking $\alpha_0 = \sqrt{-1/2}$, we define

$$\begin{gathered} f_{0,3,\alpha_0}(x,y) = x^2 + \alpha_0 xy + y^2, \qquad f_{1,3,\alpha_0}(x,y) = \omega x^2 + \alpha_0 xy + \omega^2 y^2, \\ f_{2,3,\alpha_0}(x,y) = \omega^2 x^2 + \alpha_0 xy + \omega y^2, \qquad f_3(x,y) = xy. \end{gathered} \tag{4.12}$$

Then $T(F_{3,\alpha_0})$ contains $\{1, 2, 5\}$. After the linear change $(x, y) \mapsto (i(y - cx), x + cy)$ for $c = \frac{\sqrt{6}-\sqrt{2}}{2} = \sqrt{2-\sqrt{3}}$, (4.12) becomes a scaled and permuted version of (1.1).

Example 10.

As a variation on the previous example, we again use (4.9), but specify $q = 2v \ge 4$ to be even and let

$$F'_{q,\alpha} = \{f_{0,q,\alpha}(x,y), \dots, f_{q-1,q,\alpha}(x,y)\} \in \mathcal{F}(2v, 2, 2).$$

Since $xy \notin F'_{q,\alpha}$, $m \in T(F'_{q,\alpha})$ only if there exists k so that $g_{m,k} = 0$. If $m \le v-1$, then $2v > \binom{2m+1}{1}$ so m is forced in $T(F'_{q,\alpha})$. With a careful choice of α, another exponent can be added to the ticket. We are interested in the largest possible jump. If $m = 3v-1$, then by (4.10),

$$\begin{gathered} g_{3v-1,v}(x,y) = \\ \left(\sum_{a=0}^{v-1} \frac{(3v-1)!}{a!(a+v)!(2v-1-2a)!} \alpha^{2v-1-2a} \right) (x^{4v-1}y^{2v-1} + x^{2v-1}y^{4v-1}). \end{gathered} \tag{4.13}$$

Since $v \ge 2$, there exists $\alpha = \alpha_0$ so that $g_{3v-1,v} = 0$; hence $\{1, ..., v-1, 3v-1\} \subseteq T(F'_{2v,\alpha_0})$. As (4.13) gives an equation of degree $v-1$ satisfied by α^2, we cannot expect "nice" roots α_0 for $v \ge 4$. By applying the inversion formula (4.3) to $g_{3v-1,v} = 0$, we find that

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{2v-1} \zeta_{2v}^{-jv} f^m_{j,2v,\alpha_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{2v-1} (-1)^j f^m_{j,2v,\alpha_0}, \tag{4.14}$$

hence the linear relation becomes two equal sums of v $3v-1$-st powers.

The simplest case is $v = 2$, and (4.13) gives

$$g_{5,2}(x,y) = (10\alpha^3 + 20\alpha)(x^7y^3 + x^3y^7),$$

so $\alpha = \sqrt{-2}$. If we set $y \mapsto iy$, we get a scaled version of (1.1). (The appearance of 2 in the ticket is a bonus.) If $v = 3$, then

$$g_{8,3}(x,y) = 56\alpha(3 + 5\alpha^2 + \alpha^4)(x^{11}y^5 + x^5y^{11}).$$

By setting $\alpha_0 = i\sqrt{\frac{5+\sqrt{13}}{2}}$. and noting $\zeta_6 = -\omega^2$, we see that (4.14) becomes, explicitly,

$$\begin{gathered}(x^2+\alpha_0xy+y^2)^8 + (\omega x^2+\alpha_0xy+\omega^2y^2)^8 + (\omega^2x^2+\alpha_0xy+\omega y^2)^8 = \\ (x^2-\alpha_0xy+y^2)^8 + (\omega x^2-\alpha_0xy+\omega^2y^2)^8 + (\omega^2x^2-\alpha_0xy+\omega y^2)^8 = \\ -3\bigl(\tfrac{1+\sqrt{13}}{2}\bigr)^4x^2y^2(4x^{12} - 13^{3/2}x^6y^6 + 4y^{12}).\end{gathered} \tag{4.15}$$

A computer check of $g_{v,3v-1}$ for $v \le 40$ shows that it is irreducible, except for $v = 5$ which, amazingly, has a factor of $\alpha^2 + 1$. Letting $\epsilon = \zeta_5$, and transposing as in (4.15), we make an unexpected discovery:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{4}(\epsilon^jx^2 + ixy + \epsilon^{-j}y^2)^{14} = \sum_{j=0}^{4}(\epsilon^jx^2 - ixy + \epsilon^{-j}y^2)^{14} = 5^7(xy)^{14} \tag{4.16}$$

We have inadvertently found another instance of Example 9, beyond the range where it can be expected to work. The common sum in (4.16), with i replaced by α, contains $(x^{19}y^9 + x^9y^{19})$ and $(x^{24}y^4 + x^4y^{24})$, each multiplied by different polynomials in α having $\alpha^2 + 1$ as a factor.

If we now let $f_j = \epsilon^jx^2 + ixy + \epsilon^{-j}y^2$, $0 \le j \le 4$ and $f_5 = \sqrt{-5}\ xy$, and define $F = \{f_0, \dots, f_5\}$, then

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{4} f_j - \sqrt{5}f_5 = \sum_{j=0}^{5} f_j^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{4} f_j^3 + \sqrt{5}f_5^3 = \sum_{j=0}^{5} f_j^4 = \sum_{j=0}^{5} f_j^8 = \sum_{j=0}^{5} f_j^{14}. \tag{4.17}$$

A computer check, using $\overline{m}_6 \le 24$, shows no other relations: $T(F) = \{1,2,3,4,8,14\}$ and $\overline{m}_6 \ge 14$.

Finally, if we put $(x,y) = (1,-1)$ into (4.16) and use the closed form of $\cos(\frac{2\pi k}{5})$, we get a mysterious numerical identity:

$$2\bigl(\sqrt{5}+1+2i\bigr)^{14} + 2\bigl(-\sqrt{5}+1+2i\bigr)^{14} + (4-2i)^{14} = 20^7.$$

Example 11.

This next example is embarrassingly simple by contrast. Fix a and let

$$\widehat{F}_a = \{x^a + y^a, x^a, x^{a-1}y, \dots, y^a\}.$$

Then $\widehat{F}_a \in \mathcal{F}(a+2, 2, a)$. If $m \in T(\widehat{F}_a)$, then there is a non-trivial equation

$$\sum_{k=0}^{a} \lambda_k (x^{a-k}y^k)^m + \lambda_{a+1}(x^a + y^a)^m = 0.$$

But this is impossible if $\lambda_{a+1} = 0$, so we may assume $\lambda_{a+1} = -1$ and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{a} \lambda_k (x^{a-k}y^k)^m = (x^a + y^a)^m = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} \binom{m}{\ell} x^{ma-\ell a} y^{\ell a}. \tag{4.18}$$

But (4.18) occurs if and only if $m \mid \ell a$ for each ℓ, $0 \le \ell \le m$; that is, if and only if m is a divisor of a. Thus, $T(\widehat{F}_a)$ consists of the divisors of a and $|T(\widehat{F}_a)|$ is the arithmetic function $d(a) \ll a$. This family is far from dysfunctional, but by taking $a = p^e$ for prime p, we see that $T(\widehat{F}_{p^e}) = \{1, p, p^2, \dots, p^e\}$. It follows that there is no bound on the ratio of consecutive elements in $\mathcal{T}$.

Example 12.

We combine Examples 7 and 11. For parameters $a, q \ge 2$, let

$$\widetilde{F}_{a,q} = \{x^a + y^a, x^a + \zeta_q y^a, \dots, x^a + \zeta_q^{q-1} y^a, x^a, x^{a-1}y, \dots, y^a\}.$$

Then $\widetilde{F}_{a,q} \in \mathcal{F}(q+a+1, 2, a)$. A dehomogenized version of $\widetilde{F}_{a,q}$ is due to Molluzzo ([9], see [10, p.485]) in the context that $qa \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,q})$. By Lemma 4, $m \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,q})$ if and only if there exists k, $0 \le k \le q-1$, so that

$$\sum_{\substack{i \equiv k \mod q \\ 0 \le i \le m}} \binom{m}{i} x^{(m-i)a} y^{ia}$$

is a linear combination of $\{x^{m(a-j)} y^{mj} : 0 \le j \le a\}$.

For k, $0 \le k \le q-1$, let

$$S_k(m; q, a) = \{ia : i \equiv k \mod q,\ 0 \le i \le m\} = \{(k + bq)a : 0 \le b \le \lfloor \tfrac{m-k}{q} \rfloor\}.$$

and let $Z(m; q, a)$ denote the set of k for which $S_k(m; a, q)$ only contains multiples of m. Then $m \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,q})$ if and only if some $Z(m; a, q)$ is non-empty.

If $m \le q-1$, then $S_0(m;q,a) = \{0\}$, so $m \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,q})$. Since $S_0(m;q,a)$ consists of multiples of qa, if $m \mid qa$, then $0 \in Z(m;q,a)$, so $m \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,q})$. If $|S_k(m;q,a)| \ge 2$ and $k \in Z(m;q,a)$, then m divides ka and $(k+q)a$, so m is a divisor of qa.

In the remaining case, $m \ge q$ is not a divisor of aq, but there exists k so that $m \mid ka$ and $S_k(m;q,a)$ is a singleton, so that $k \ge m-(q-1)$. The existence of such m depends on the arithmetic properties of a and q. If $a = q = p$ is prime, then no such m exists, and $T(\widetilde{F}_{p,p}) = \{1,\dots,p,p^2\}$. On the other hand, if $a = q = 6$, say, then it is not hard to show that $m = 8, 10$ satisfy the criteria and

$$T(\widetilde{F}_{6,6}) = \{1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,12,18,36\}$$

Note that $F_{6,6}$ is (barely) dysfunctional.

Since $a^2 \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a,a})$ where $\widetilde{F}_{a,a} \in \mathcal{F}(2a+1,2,a)$, and $a(a+1) \in T(\widetilde{F}_{a+1,a})$ where $\widetilde{F}_{a+1,a} \in \mathcal{F}(2a+1,2,a)$, we obtain Molluzzo's bound: $\overline{m}_r \ge \lfloor \frac{(r-1)^2}{4} \rfloor$.

Example 13.

The Euler-Binet (complete) solution to (3.5) for $m = 3$ (see [6, p.200] for a derivation) is

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(x,y,z) &= (x+3y)(x^2+3y^2)z - z^4,\\
f_2(x,y,z) &= (-x+3y)(x^2+3y^2)z + z^4,\\
f_3(x,y,z) &= (x^2+3y^2)^2 - (x-3y)z^3,\\
f_4(x,y,z) &= -(x^2+3y^2)^2 + (x+3y)z^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $F = \{f_j\} \in \mathcal{F}(4,3,4)$, and it can be shown that $T(F) = \{3\}$. If we let $f'_j(x,y) = f_j(x,x,y)$, so $F' = \{f'_j\} \in \mathcal{F}(4,2,4)$, then $T(F') = \{3\}$ as well.

Example 14.

Euler's binary septic solution to (3.5) for $m = 4$ (see [6, p.201] is

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(x,y) &= x^7 + x^5y^2 - 2x^3y^4 + 3x^2y^5 + xy^6,\\
f_2(x,y) &= x^6y - 3x^5y^2 - 2x^4y^3 + x^2y^5 + y^7,\\
f_3(x,y) &= x^7 + x^5y^2 - 2x^3y^4 - 3x^2y^5 + xy^6,\\
f_4(x,y) &= x^6y + 3x^5y^2 - 2x^4y^3 + x^2y^5 + y^7.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $F = \{f_j\} \in \mathcal{F}(4,2,7)$, and it can be shown that $T(F) = \{4\}$. This can be seen by a shortcut, avoiding the machinery of Theorem 1. Suppose $\sum_{j=1}^4 \lambda_j f_j^m = 0$. Then consideration of the terms x^{7m} and y^{7m} shows that $\lambda_3 = -\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_4 = -\lambda_2$. Hence by transposition, $\lambda_1(f_1^m - f_3^m) = \lambda_4(f_2^m - f_4^m)$. Evaluation at (1,1) implies that

$\lambda_1(4^m - (-2)^m) = \lambda_4((-2)^m - 4^m)$, hence $\lambda_4 = -\lambda_1$, and the only possible relation is $f_1^m + f_2^m - f_3^m - f_4^m = 0$. This equation can now easily be checked for $m \le 8$.

It is apparently unknown whether there is a non-trivial solution to the equation $f_1^4 + f_2^4 = f_3^4 + f_4^4$ in real binary forms of degree d for $3 \le d \le 6$.

It seems clear that the vast, centuries-old literature of Diophantine parameterizations can be data-mined for many more interesting examples of tickets.

5. Generalizations, speculations and open questions

This final section collects a number of miscellaneous remarks.

There is no reason to restrict our attention to forms over $\mathbf{C}$; for any field k, one might just as easily define $\mathcal{F}_k(r,n,d)$, where the forms have coefficients in k. It would be particularly interesting to study these for $k = \mathbf{Q}$ or $\mathbf{R}$. It is proved in [12] that there is no solution to (3.4) for real polynomials when $m = 5$. Thus, $(1,2,5) \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{R}}(4,2,2)$, but (3.8) shows that $(1,2,4) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{Q}}(4,2,2)$. The forms in the highly dysfunctional family F_q in Example 8 are $\mathbf{R}$-combinations of x^2+y^2, $i(x^2-y^2)$ and xy, and hence can be made real by taking $(x,y) \mapsto (x+iy, x-iy)$. It seems hard to decide whether there exists a change of variables which makes a given family real, or rational.

One can also sharpen the definition of $T(F)$. Let

$$\delta_m(F) = |F| - \dim(\mathrm{span}(\{f_j^m\}),$$

so that $T(F) = \{m : \delta_m(F) > 0\}$.

Conjecture 2.

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \delta_m(F) \le \binom{r-1}{2}. \tag{5.1}$$

This conjecture implies Theorem 1 of course, and is valid for the examples given where $|T(F)| = \binom{r-1}{2}$ for $r = 3, 4$. Further, if $(n,d) = (2,1)$, then $\delta_m(F) = r - (m+1)$ for $m \le r-2$, and (5.1) is sharp.

As my algebraic geometry friends have pointed out, the topic of this paper is "really" the study of rational curves lying on the intersection of several Fermat varieties of different degrees. The rub in proving Conjecture 1 would be trying to ensure that the curve doesn't lie on other Fermat varieties. By Theorem 2, every finite set of positive integers A is a subset of a member of $\mathcal{T}(r,2,1)$ for r sufficiently large. What makes a ticket interesting is as much what's *not* in it as well as what's in it. We can weaken Conjecture 1 enough to make it very plausible: suppose $A = \{m_k\}$ is finite and $w \notin A$. Does there exist F so that $A \subseteq T(F)$ and $w \notin T(F)$? If not, then the linear dependence of $\{f_j^{m_k}\}$ forces the dependence of $\{f_j^w\}$. This seems unlikely.

Example 1 (Part Four).

Consider the intersection of the plane $M_1(t) = 0$ and the conic $M_2(t) = 0$. Then $t_4 = -(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)$, and

$$t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + (-(t_1 + t_2 + t_3))^2 = 2(t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_1t_2 + t_1t_3 + t_2t_3) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

It is not difficult to diagonalize (5.2) as

$$(t_1 - t_2)^2 + 2(t_1 + t_2)^2 + (t_1 + t_2 + 2t_3)^2 = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Let

$$t_1 - t_2 = x^2 - y^2, \quad \sqrt{2}(t_1 + t_2) = 2xy, \quad i(t_1 + t_2 + 2t_3) = x^2 + y^2$$

be the usual Pythagorean parameterization of (5.3). After solving for the t_i's, we discover that $t_j = f_j$ (c.f. (1.1))!

The fact that $M_5(t) = 0$ as well can be explained in several ways. First,

$$\begin{gathered} t_1^5 + t_2^5 + t_3^5 + (-(t_1 + t_2 + t_3))^5 = \\ -5(t_1 + t_2)(t_1 + t_3)(t_2 + t_3)(t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_1t_2 + t_1t_3 + t_2t_3), \end{gathered} \tag{5.4}$$

so that (5.2) implies that (5.4) vanishes as well.

More generally, let e_k, $1 \le k \le 4$, denote the k-th elementary symmetric function in four variables. By Newton's Theorem, if $p(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ is a symmetric polynomial, then there is a polynomial P so that $p = P(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4)$. If p is *any* symmetric form of degree five in four variables (not just M_5), then

$$p = \alpha_1 e_1^5 + \alpha_2 e_1^3 e_2 + \alpha_3 e_1^2 e_3 + \alpha_4 e_1 e_2^2 + \alpha_5 e_1 e_4 + \alpha_6 e_2 e_3. \tag{5.5}$$

If $M_1(t) = M_2(t) = 0$, then $e_1(t) = e_2(t) = 0$, and so $p = 0$ as well; an explicit representation of $p \in (e_1, e_2)$ is found by solving for α_k in (5.5).

This construction generalizes. Suppose $r \ge 4$ and let A_r denote the set of integers which *cannot* be written in the form $a(r-1) + br$ for non-negative integers a and b. It is well-known that $|A_r| = \binom{r-1}{2}$ and the largest element in A_r is $r(r-1) - r - (r-1)$. Suppose

$$t_1^k + \cdots + t_r^k = 0, \qquad 1 \le k \le r - 2, \tag{5.6}$$

then the same argument given above implies that any homogeneous symmetric polynomial in r variables whose degree lies in A_r will vanish. If we could find pairwise non-proportional polynomials f_j, $1 \le j \le r$, satisfying (5.6), then we would thereby construct a family F of r polynomials with $T(F) = A_r$. However, it appears that no such parameterization of (5.6) exists for $r \ge 5$.

There is another, geometric, interpretation of (1.1). Define the four pairs of complex numbers (β_j, γ_j) by the factorization $f_j(x,y) = \sigma_j(x - \beta_j y)(x - \gamma_j y)$. Under the standard stereographic projection of $\mathbf{C}$ to the unit sphere S^2, the four pairs (β_j, γ_j) map to the antipodal pairs of vertices of an inscribed cube. This is reminiscent of Klein's classical work on the icosahedron.

We conclude this section with some more open problems.

Example 9 shows that $|T(F)|$ can be as large as $\frac{3}{2}r - 3$. This is probably not maximal. Is $|T(F)| = \mathcal{O}(r)$? If not, what is the true growth rate? Can $c \cdot r^2$ be achieved for some $c > 0$? Does $\lim\limits_{r\to\infty} r^{-2}\overline{m}_r$ exist?

Is it true that $T(F)$ contains at most $r - 2$ consecutive integers? This is true in all the dysfunctional families presented here, and would subsume Theorem 5.

Finally, in view of the last three remarks in §1, we make the following definitions:

$$\mathcal{T}(r,n,\infty) = \bigcup_d \mathcal{T}(r,n,d) = \lim_{d\to\infty} \mathcal{T}(r,n,d);$$

$$\mathcal{T}(r,\infty,d) = \bigcup_n \mathcal{T}(r,n,d) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{T}(r,n,d);$$

$$\mathcal{T}(r,\infty,\infty) = \bigcup_{n,d} \mathcal{T}(r,n,d).$$

Since $\mathcal{T}(r,\infty,\infty)$ is finite, it must actually be achieved by a finite $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d)$. Can we compute "minimal" $d(n,r)$ so that $\mathcal{T}(r,n,d(n,r)) = \mathcal{T}(r,n,\infty)$, "minimal" $n(d,r)$ so that $\mathcal{T}(r,n(d,r),d) = \mathcal{T}(r,\infty,d)$ or "minimal" $(n(r),d(r))$ so that $\mathcal{T}(r,n(r),d(r)) = \mathcal{T}(r,\infty,\infty)$?

6. Acknowledgments

I thank my colleagues Mike Bennett, Sean Sather-Wagstaff and Jack Wetzel, the organizers of the Analytic Number Theory, Commutative Ring Theory and Geometric Potpourri seminars at UIUC, for their tolerance in letting me woodshed this material in their groups. I also thank Ricky Pollock, Marie-Francoise Roy and Micha Sharir for inviting me to speak at the DIMACS workshop on Algorithmic and Quantitative Aspects of Real Algebraic Geometry in Mathematics and Computer Science in March 2001.

I thank my colleagues Nigel Boston, Dan Grayson and Marcin Mazur for useful conversations. Marcin alerted me to the work of Mark Green. I would also like to thank János Kollár, Noam Elkies, Mark Green and Gary Gundersen for helpful email correspondence.

More than is customary in such acknowledgments, the author wants to emphasize that he is solely responsible for any errors in content or aberrations in mathematical taste.

References

[1] Chlebowicz, A., A. Sładek, M. Wołowiec-Musiał, *Automorphisms of certain forms of higher degree over ordered fields*; Elsevier preprint, January 13, 2001.

[2] Darmon, H. and Granville, A., *On the equations* $z^m = F(x,y)$ *and* $Ax^p + By^q = Cz^r$, Bull. London Math. Soc. **27** (1995), 513 – 543.

[3] Dickson, L. E., *History of the Theory of Numbers*, vol. II, Diophantine Analysis, Chelsea, New York, 1966.

[4] Green, M. L., *Some Picard theorems for holomorphic maps to algebraic varieties*, Amer. J. Mathematics **97** (1975), 43 – 75.

[5] Gundersen, G. G., *Meromorphic solutions of* $f^6 + g^6 + h^6 = 1$, Analysis (Munich) **18** (1998), 285–290.

[6] Hardy, G. H. and E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, Fifth edition, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1979.

[7] Hayman, W., *Warings Problem für analytische Funktionen.*, Bayer. Akad. Wiss. Math.-Natur. Kl. Sitzungsber. **1984** (1985), 1–13.

[8] Hayman, W., *Nevanlinna Theory 1945–1995*, XVIth Rolf Nevanlinna Colloquium (I. Laine, O. Martio, eds.), W. de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1996, pp. 1–11.

[9] Molluzzo, J., Doctoral Thesis, Yeshiva Univ. (1972).

[10] Newman, D.J. and M. Slater, *Waring's Problem for the Ring of Polynomials*, J. Number Theory **11** (1979), 477–487.

[11] Reznick, B., *Sums of even powers of real linear forms*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **96** (1992), no. 463.

[12] Reznick, B., *Equal sums of higher powers of quadratic forms*; in preparation. Seminar notes can be found at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/~reznick/92100notes.pdf.

[13] Ribenboim, P., *13 Lectures on Fermat's Last Theorem*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1979.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1409 W. Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801

E-mail address: `reznick@math.uiuc.edu`